

15990

REMARKS

Claims 7, 11 and 12 have been amended and Claims 13-35 have been added. Claims 1-35, as amended, remain in the application

Claims 7, 11 and 12 have been amended to correct several minor typographical errors. No new matter is added by these amendments.

In the Office Action dated January 23, 2003, Paper No. 6, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0048499 of Baker. Enclosed is Declaration Under Rule 131(a) of the Applicants establishing invention of the subject matter of rejected Claims 1-12 prior to the February 26, 2001 filing date of the published Baker application and prior to the February 29, 2000 filing date of the related provisional application. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this ground for rejection of Claims 1-12 has been overcome.

New independent Claim 13 and dependent Claims 14-35 have been added to further define Applicants' invention. No new matter is added by these new claims.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure. The Examiner cited the following foreign patent to show the best foreign prior art found: PCT No. WO 200058866A to Levy et al. According to the Examiner, the Levy reference discloses a multilingual on-line matchmaking method over the Internet for use in connection with dating services, which involves searching an object database to find candidate data partially matching with a subscriber request.

The Examiner cited the following non-patent literature to show the best non-patent literature prior art found: www.match.com. The Examiner stated that the Match.com system uses the Internet and compiles user profiles (including personality types) and matches them with compatible users in order to help the users establish a relationship.

Applicants reviewed these references and believe that they do not show or suggest the method and system defined by Claims 1-35.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above arguments, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.